

## **ADDRESSES**

## APPENDIX

### THIRD PARTIES

easy and will be numerous political questions in respect to which the public will have different opinions and be divided; but as these questions must differ among themselves in intrinsic or general importance, it is a matter of course that the less will be waived or subordinated to the more important according to public estimation; so that the grand and leading issues must always be in relation to that question which is, or is assumed to be, most fundamental in the policy of the government. And, as these issues cannot be but two, the mass of the public will be divided between them; and consequently there can never be more than two leading parties in a free government. So all history, as well as theory, decides.

Of course, one or the other of these leading parties will and must administer the government, directing and moulding it according to its own character, aims and aspirations.

Beside the two leading parties, an indefinite number of minor ones may be organized to sustain or promote principles or measures which those parties repudiate or disregard. Inasmuch as such parties have become quite fashionable in our country, it is of vast importance to arrive at a clear comprehension of the following question respecting them—What relation do they sustain to the leading parties, and to the government in general? I am well aware of the various answers their adherents offer to this question; but nevertheless my answer is, that while in name and superficial appearance such a party is alike quite separate from and independent of both the leading ones, it is in fact PRACTICALLY AN ALLY AND HELPER of one of them, and of that one too on which the smallest number of adherents are derived. Nor can possibly be otherwise. Suppose the Convention which is called to meet at Pittsburgh in August should organize a new Anti-Slavery party.—It will be composed, partly of Whigs, and partly of so-called Democrats; that is, of persons who have belonged to these parties respectively, and would vote with them, according to their ~~similarities~~, but for their attitude on the Slavery question. If the Whigs and Democrats combined in this new organization be exactly equal (which is not to be expected,) it will not essentially disturb the balance between the leading parties; but if a majority of those who compose it be Whigs, the balance will be turned in favor of the Democratic party, just in proportion to the number of that majority. Every vote withdrawn from the Whig candidate, by that majority, will be practically one cast for the Democratic candidate; and thus, if a majority of the professed Anti-Slavery party be Whigs, it must necessarily become the ally and helper of the Democratic party in the final issue, and must be efficient.

as such in exact proportion to the number of that majority.

Let these facts and principles be thoroughly pondered by Anti-Slavery Whigs, lest they build the very bulwarks of that oppression they so earnestly seek to destroy. Let them remember, that it was precisely by means of the help thus given by the Liberty party to the Democratic party in 1844, that the latter succeeded in electing James K. Polk, and that all the pernicious results of his administration were brought about—the annexation of Texas; the Mexican war; and in the issues of those measures, including the Fugitive Slave Law. Let them contemplate, in the light of this fact of the past, the overshadowed results of the election of Pierce—the conquest and annexation of Cuba; another war with Mexico, ending in wresting from her, another portion of her domains to be made into Slave states; the consequent subsequent ascendancy of the Slaveholding power over the nation; the government administered, and all its policy and patronage wielded, according to the interest and dictation of that power; the internal Slave trade increased and slave property made more valuable; all agitation against slavery resisted and as far as possible suppressed; the Fugitive Slave Law upheld and enforced; and the blight of so-called Democratic politics in general falling heavily and perniciously on all the best interests of the country. Anti-Slavery Whigs! are you willing to aid in the inauguration and execution of this programme of performances? If so, your way is plain. You need not vote for Pierce directly. You can do so more effectually, perhaps, by assisting in getting up a new party, called Anti-Slavery, Free Soil, or by any other name. Do what you can to induce your fellow Whigs to vote for its candidates, and be sure to vote for them yourselves. Such a party, it is certain, will draw vastly more adherents from the Whig than from the Democratic ranks. Let the majority from the former be 20,000; and every one of that 20,000 will count one for Pierce in the end. The simplest knowledge of equations will teach you this. And if Pierce should prove to have just 20,000 of a majority, you will know and will have whatever satisfaction such knowledge will bring, that you in your zeal for Anti-Slavery, have, by making him President, and thus securing the execution of the programme designed for him, by his party, done more against the cause you profess to love, than any equal number of the most ardent and effective Pro-Slavery propagandists in the United States could do in a lifetime.

But, perhaps some of you would prefer not to vote at all. If so, it will practically amount to the same thing; for the main point is not to vote for Scott, as every vote withheld from him is in effect one cast for

Ditto. Refraining from the ballot-box is by no means restraining from voting practically.

Now, if all this be true, (and who can deny it?) is there not a responsibility on every one of you respecting the issues between the leading parties? If any one of you were asked which of these parties, or their candidates, he would prefer should succeed in the coming election, as one or the other of them must, would not your unhesitating answer be—“The Whigs—Scott and Graham?” In addition to your agreement with them in general politics, would you not assuredly anticipate less servility in them to the Slaveocracy, and action more favorable on the whole, far more favorable, to freedom? And are you not bound, then, by the most sacred obligation to give your suffrage in their favor? Have you a moral right so to vote as practically to promote the success of their adversaries?—or not to vote at all, which has the same effect? Possibly, however, some among you may say that “the two leading parties are alike committed to Slavery, and that there is no choice between them.” Suppose it be granted that they are alike on the subject of Slavery, there certainly is a choice between them on general politics. Inasmuch, therefore, as you MUST practically vote for one or the other of them, is there not a responsibility on you to vote for that party whose general principles and policy you believe to be most beneficent and healthful to our country, now and hereafter? When you cannot secure all the good you would, are you not bound to secure all you can? But there is a choice between them on the Slavery question. What do the antecedents of each testify? In several instances, within the last twenty years, the encroachments of Slavery have been resisted by the Whigs, (as, for example, in respect to the right of petition, the annexation of Texas, and the Mexican war,) while, with unvarying constancy, the Democrats have shown themselves its devoted, unwavering allies. Not a thing has it demanded, which, as a party, they have not been supple to perform. And will any one deny that now, as all along, the Anti-Slavery element, in the Whig party, is immeasurably greater than in the other? Do not the respective nominations of the two parties themselves show which way their currents run? Is it not palpable that, while that of the Democrats is towards Slavery, that of the Whigs is, on the whole, strongly towards its opposite? Look at the fact that Scott, who steadfastly refused to declare himself determined to sustain the Fugitive Slave law, should he be elected to the Presidency, received the nomination to that office at Baltimore; while Fillmore and Webster, who were openly and positively committed to sustain it, were rejected, although the aspirants

of the former were supported by the entire Southern delegation. Look also at the fact that so many Southern Whigs are bolting, declaring Scott to be the candidate of Seward and Greeley. Edifying spectacle! Southern Whigs repudiating Scott as Anti-Slavery! and Northern Anti-Slavery Whigs repudiating him as Pro-Slavery! Verily, extremes meet! Look further at the respective attitudes of Scott and Pierce in respect to the Fugitive Slave Law. Says Gen. Pierce, in his letter, declaring his acceptance of his nomination—"I accept the nomination upon the Platform adopted by the Convention, not because it is expected of me, as a candidate, but because the principles it embraces command the approbation of my judgment, and with them I think I can safely say, that there has been no word or action of my life in conflict." Has any thing like this ever proceeded from Scott? As to the platforms of the two parties, that of the Democrats is far worse than that of the Whigs. The Editor of the National Era, whose political principles and tendencies are all adverse to the Whigs, thus expresses his opinion in reference to the comparative stringency of Whig and Democratic resolutions on the question of Slavery:—

"We have to say that they differ as it respects agitation on the subject of Slavery. The Whig resolve does not go so far as the Democratic. The former says—

"And we *deprecate* all future agitation of the questions thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and we will *discountenance* all efforts to continue or renew such agitation, whenever, wherever, and however, the attempt may be made."

The latter says—

"The Democratic Party will resist all attempts at renewing in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery Question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made."

One "*deprecates*" and will "*discountenance*," the other will "*resist*"—a stronger word, with a broader meaning. One will discountenance a renewal of the agitation of the *questions settled by the Compromise and the Fugitive Law*; the other will resist the renewal of "*the agitation of the Slavery Question, under whatever shape or color.*"

The Whig resolve does not exclude agitation in regard to slavery in the District, the coastwise slave trade, claims on Congress for indemnity for slaves, the bearings of slavery on the question of the annexation of Cuba, on the possible dismemberment of Mexico, and the future annexation of its Northern States; or on the policy sometimes attempted to be brought to the attention of Congress, of colonizing the free people of color. But the Democratic resolve does exclude all this, by

its pledge to "resist all attempts at renewing in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery Question, under whatever shape or color."

The Whig resolve does not deprecate, or pledge the party to disown, the agitation of the question of slavery, as a moral or religious question; but the Democratic resolve does, in the comprehensive, unqualified term, "under whatever shape or color."

The *Washington Union*, the central organ of the Democracy so-called, denounces the eighth resolution of the Whig Platform, because it does not recognize the "finality;" and Dr. Bailey, in the National Era, says of the Fugitive slave law and Slavery agitation:—

"The question is clearly left open, and the Whig resolutions contemplate two ways in which it might be legitimately renewed; in one for the purpose of amending the law so as to prevent evasion; in the other, of so amending it as to correct abuse. The opponents and supporters of the law are left equally at liberty to agitate this subject."

The simple truth is, that the resolutions of the Whig platform, will bind Scott, if elected, to nothing more than his oath of office would bind him to, if they had never been penned. His oath binds him to execute the laws, and the Whig platform does nothing more.

Now, in view of all these facts, I put the question—Is there no difference and no choice between the parties and their respective candidates in their attitude respecting Slavery? Is there not an immense difference? and is it not wholly in favor of the Whigs? Let candor decide.

But, perhaps to this you will say, that, "although the Whigs are less zealous to freedom than the Democrats, still they are far from the ground they should occupy, and therefore to vote with them for their candidates would be to sanction all that is vicious in their position."—

I answer, that, if this objection has any validity, it must apply in all similar cases, and consequently it dooms you always to vote *so as practically* to help the worse instead of the better of two parties, between whom a choice must be made, until the better of them is perfectly right according to your standard. Can that be a sound principle? Is it not pushing the doctrine of *sanctioning* into the ground? The truth is, that in voting you sanction just what you mean to, and nothing else; and, since you must *practically* support either the worse or the better of the two leading parties, are you not bound to *mean* to support the better? By voting with the Whigs, you will sanction not, what is vicious in their position, but what is better in it than in that of the Democrats. This is the only doctrine of sanctioning which would not, in the end, make all parties impossible, and set every man in absolute isolation from his fellowmen.

Get, to escape all this, some of you will say—"The principle you urge, is the principle of expediency; but, in opposition to it, we maintain that we must leave consequences to God and do right. This is duty; and we will therefore go with a new party." I answer that, whether the principle I urge is that of expediency or not, it is the principle on which the whole science of politics rests. It would indeed be very fine to have the government, of our country absolutely perfect, as we conceive that of Heaven to be, and to have it perfectly administered; but if such a government cannot be realized in our degenerate world, it is expedient to have the best one practicable, and to have it administered in the best practicable way. And, as ballots, and not theories, convey the administrative power and policy among us, it is expedient for every one so to vote as, according to his best judgment, *forecasting consequence*, will, on the whole, effect the greatest good, or, which is the same thing, prevent the greatest evil. And, just because it is expedient to vote thus, it is duty—stern, solemn, inevitable duty; and of course to vote so, is practically to commit the government to the worse instead of the better leading party, is folly, and, unless done ignorantly, sin.

And now will you close your eyes on all this, and practically cast your vote for Pierce, by casting it for Chase, or whoever may be nominated by the new party to be organized at Pittsburg, and think to exculpate yourselves by saying—"We must do right and leave consequences to God!" In the name of our country, in the name of the enslaved, in the name of all that is good in our institutions, in the name of Heaven, how can such a course be right? The very object of voting is to produce consequences foreseen and intended by the voter; and since every vote, actual or virtual, must produce consequences affecting our entire country for better or worse—consequences which every one, competent to vote, can, and is bound to forecast to some extent, in a conceivable sense, unless it be a most pernicious one, is there in the maxim you announce? The only possible way of determining for what candidate it is right to vote, is to forecast and compare the consequences of voting for each; and yet, disregarding the fact that, if you vote for the nominee of a new party, you do necessarily virtually vote for Pierce and the results of his election, you pitch your ballot into his trap, saying—"We will do right and leave consequences to God!"—Was there ever a greater absurdity? Nor is it less pernicious than gross; for while devotion to the slave is its professed object, it builds his prison-walls higher and stronger, and rivets his fetters.

Anti-Slavery Whigs.—What possible good do you hope to effect by going into a new party? Do you say you will compel one or both of

the old parties to take positive ground against Slavery? How can you, when you are really aiding that one which is most devoted to it, and thus contributing to put the entire government into its service? What did the Liberty party effect, which was organized and maintained for the same professed object? Let the election of Polk, the annexation of Texas, the Mexican War, the entire series of measures thence resulting, including the Fugitive Slave Law and the unpropitious aspect of things existing answer. The truth is, any party, organized in a free government, aside from the two leading ones, is and always must be a political vice, from which, as a rule, no good can result. It does not act on the principle of holding the balance of power between the leading parties, just because it is itself an organized party. Let any considerable number of voters cluster around the principle or measure which they wish the government to adopt; let them not organize a new party, but say to the existing ones—If you will both adopt this principle, or measure, we will continue to vote with you according to our former political affinities; but if you will not both do this, then we will vote with whichever of you will do it so long as is necessary for its success; let them take this attitude, and they will hold the balance of power without being the ally of either. But let them organize themselves into a new party, and their vantage-ground is lost, their power gone; and thenceforth they are the ally and helper of one or the other of the leading parties without anything but contempt gained in return. Sampson, shorn of his locks and blind, must grind corn for the Philistines. But the evil will not stop here, for its leaders will become aspiring and ambitious, and demagogic in its worst forms is certain to be unfolded. The history of the Liberty party will confirm my positions.

In concluding this address, I beg you to remember that if Mexico shall be elected in consequence of the votes diverted from Roger in the coming election; if, as a consequence, Cuba shall be conquered and annexed, or more territory wrested from Mexico; if the Slave power shall be augmented and raised to the ascendancy in our government; if legislation, still more frightful in atrocity than that contained in the Fugitive Slave Law, shall blight our national character and fame, it will not be in your power to say, when your country shall turn her marred visage towards you reprovingly, "Never say we

S. B. COCHRAN.